



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	G DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/656,538 09/06/2000		Michael Lee	INT1P211	9912		
21912	7590	06/04/2004		EXAMINER		
VAN PELT		ID #200	MAURO JR, THOMAS J			
10050 N. FOOTHILL BLVD #200 CUPERTINO, CA 95014			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	,			2143	10	
				DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004	(0	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

Application No. Applicant(s) Application No. Application No. Application Papers Art Unit Application Papers Application Papers Application Papers Art Unit Application Papers Applicat	*				Λ					
Examiner Thomas J. Mauro Jr. 2143			Application No.	Applicant(s)	/	\ <u>`</u>				
Thomas J. Mauro Jr. 2143 Thomas J. 2143 Thomas J. Mauro Jr. 2143 Thomas J. 2143 Thom			09/656,538	LEE ET AL.		٧				
Previol for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of item raps be enabled useful for provision of 3 °CER 1.13(6). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filled Extension of item raps be enabled useful for provision of 3 °CER 1.13(6). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filled Extension of the reply reported above is less than thery (30) days, a reply within the satisatory minimum of thinty (30) days will be considered timely. If the period for reply reported above is less than thery (30) days, a reply within the satisatory minimum of thinty (30) days will be considered timely. If No period for reply reported above is less than thery (30) days, a reply within the satisatory minimum of thinty (30) days will be considered timely. If No period for reply reported above is less than the reported for reply will, by station, cause the application to become ABANGONED (35 V.S.C. § 133). If No period for reply reported to reply will, by station, cause the application to become ABANGONED (35 V.S.C. § 133). Status 1 ∑ Responsive to communication(s) filled on 0.99 March 2004. 2a) ∑ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final. 3 ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4 ∑ Claim(s)		Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of three rays be available under the possions of 37 CFR 1.30(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filled - If the period for reply selected above. The maximum statutory parties with the statutory minimum of thiny (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply selected above. The maximum statutory parties will apply and will expire SN (8) MONTES from the maxifing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply selected above. The maximum statutory parties will apply and will expire SN (8) MONTES from the maximum statutory and will expire SN (8) MONTES from the maximum statutory and will expire SN (8) MONTES from the maximum statutory and will expire SN (8) MONTES from the maximum statutory and will expire SN (8) MONTES from the maximum statutory. - If NO period for reply is a specified above. The maximum statutory and will expire SN (8) MONTES from the maximum statutory. - If NO period for reply is a specified above. The maximum statutory and will expire so will be specified and will be selected and will be selected and will be selected to the maximum statutory. - If NO period for reply is application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. - Disposition of Claims - A) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. - Disposition of Claims - A) Claim(s)	·									
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of mem rapk parallelist under the proteines of 3° CFR 1.13(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after 51x (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of 10° CFR 1.13(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after 51x (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the communication o			pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ddress					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on @9 March 2004. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-7,10-12 and 18-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 1-7,10-12 and 18-21 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 1-7,10-12 and 18-21 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) are subjected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-7,10-12 and 18-21 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) are subjected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on @9 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. Sea 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. Sea 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(e) 1) Notice of Pratsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) and International Discourre Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB00)	THE - External after - If the - If NC - Failure Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered time the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 3 ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7.10-12 and 18-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s)	Status									
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7.10-12 and 18-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s)	1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 M	larch 2004.							
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4)	•									
All b Some * c) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Altachment(s) Al) Claim(s) 1-7.10-12 and 18-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5)	3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	e merits is					
4)		,—								
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) □ The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 March 2004</u> is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) □ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of: 1. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) □ Notice of Paferences Cited (PTO-892) □ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) □ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Dispositi	ion of Claims								
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2004 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ☐ . 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Greferences Cited (PTO-992) 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-7,10-12 and 18-21</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.	wn from consideration.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Applicat	ion Papers								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some colonomic None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 March 2004</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Settion is required if the drawing(s) is objection.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).					
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	 a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). 									
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	Attachmen	nt(s)								
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	1) 🛛 Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)								
	3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal F		O-152)					

Art Unit: 2143

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This action is responsive to the amendment (Paper # 8) filed on March 9, 2004. Claims 1-7, 10-12 and 18-21 remain pending. In accordance with the restriction election, claims 8-9 and 13-17 have been cancelled.
- 2. Claims 1-7, 10-12 and 18-21 are presented for further examination.
- 3. Objection to the drawing has been withdrawn upon having received the new corrected drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-7, 10-12 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banavar et al. (U.S. 6,336,119) in view of Calvert et al., entitled "Core Selection Methods for Multicast Routing".

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 1, Banavar teaches a method of multicasting information to a set of clients comprising:

determining a primary client using network location of the client, the network location relating to a data topology [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 66-67 and Col. 6 lines 41-44 – Network location data, based upon the current configuration of the network, i.e. topology, is used to configure and group the brokers, i.e. primary clients, into clusters];

transmitting the information to a primary client from a server [Banavar -- Figures 1 and 4A and Col. 3 lines 7-12 – Brokers, i.e. primary clients, receive information from central source, i.e. publishing broker (Col. 2 lines 54-55)]; and

instructing the primary client to forward the information to a secondary client [Banavar - Figures 1 and 4A and Col. 3 lines 13-15 – Brokers forward the information to their consumers].

Banavar fails to teach additionally using performance information to determine a primary client. Calvert, however, teaches selecting a primary client, i.e. a broker, based upon performance criteria [Calvert -- Page 640, Section 3.5, paragraph 2 - Core node, i.e. primary client, is chosen using a performance based method].

In addition, Calvert and Banavar discloses that it would be advantageous use the relationship between performance and topology to make better core choices [Calvert -- Page 640, Section 3.3, paragraph 1] [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 61-62].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of performance information in determining a primary client, as taught by Calvert into the invention of Banavar, in order to achieve a fast performing

multicasting system which routes the packets of information to all nodes in a short amount of time.

Regarding claim 2, Banavar-Calvert teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including receiving performance information from the set of clients [Calvert -- Page 640, Sec. 3.4, Paragraph 2 – In order to know the performance of nodes, the system must receive performance information, i.e. bandwidth and delay, from each of the nodes].

Regarding claim 3, Banavar-Calvert teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including pinging clients to determine the network location of the clients [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 66-67 - Col. 6 lines 41-44 - Banavar teaches using network location to group clients together. In order to determine the network location, it is required for the server to ping the clients and use that address to determine the client's location on the network. Therefore, this limitation is implicitly taught].

Regarding claim 4, Banavar-Calvert teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, wherein the information is streaming video [Calvert -- Page 638, Sec 2.2 – Videoconference applications, i.e. streaming video]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include streaming video as the multicast data as taught by Calvert, into the invention of Banavar, in order to efficiently send out data which normally would take up a lot of bandwidth and time.

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 5, Banavar teaches a method of multicasting information to a set of clients comprising:

selecting a subset of the clients to be primary clients based on the network location relating to a data topology [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 66-67 and Col. 6 lines 41-44 - Network location data, based upon the current configuration of the network, i.e. topology, is used to determine and furthermore to configure and group the brokers, i.e. primary clients, into clusters]; and

transmitting the information to the primary clients for retransmission to other clients in the set of clients [Banavar -- Figures 1 and 4A and Col. 3 lines 7-15 – Brokers, i.e. primary clients, receive information from central source, i.e. publishing broker (Col. 2 lines 54-55) and forward the information to their consumers, i.e. clients].

Banavar fails to explicitly teach determining a performance parameter for each of the clients and selecting a subset of the clients to be primary clients based upon performance information.

Calvert, however, teaches determining a performance parameter for each of the clients [Calvert - Page 640, Sec. 3.4, Paragraph 2 – In order to know the performance of nodes, the system must receive performance information, i.e. bandwidth and delay, from each of the nodes] and selecting a subset of the clients to be primary clients based upon the performance information [Calvert -- Page 640, Sec. 3.5, Paragraph 2 – Core node, i.e. primary client, is chosen using a performance based method].

In addition, Calvert and Banavar disclose that it would be advantageous use the relationship between performance and topology to make better core choices [Calvert -- Page 640, Section 3.3, paragraph 1] [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 61-62].

Art Unit: 2143

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining performance parameters for the clients and using performance information in selecting a subset of clients to be primary clients, as taught by Calvert into the invention of Banavar, in order to achieve a fast performing multicasting system which routes the packets of information to all nodes in a short amount of time.

Regarding claim 6, Banavar teaches a method of multicasting information to a set of clients comprising:

determining a network location for each of the clients; selecting a subset of the clients to be primary clients based on the network location [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 66-67 - Col. 6 lines 1-3 - In order to group brokers into clusters by network location, it is required that the location be determined, i.e. pinging the clients];

determining a primary client using the network location of each of the clients, the network location relating to a data topology [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 66-67 and Col. 6 lines 41-44 - Network location data, based upon the current configuration of the network, i.e. topology, is used to configure and group the brokers, i.e. primary clients, into clusters]; and

transmitting the information to the primary clients for retransmission to other clients in the set of clients [Banavar -- Figures 1 and 4A and Col. 3 lines 7-15 – Brokers, i.e. primary clients, receive information from a central source, i.e. publishing broker (Col. 2 lines 54-55) and forward the information to their consumers, i.e. clients].

Banavar fails to explicitly teach determining a primary client using performance information and selecting a subset of clients to be primary clients based on performance information.

Calvert, however, teaches selecting a primary client, i.e. a broker, based upon performance criteria [Calvert -- Page 640, Section 3.5, paragraph 2 - Core node, i.e. primary client, is chosen using a performance based method] and selecting a subset of the clients to be primary clients based upon the performance information [Calvert -- Page 640, Sec. 3.5, Paragraph 2 - Core node, i.e. primary client, is chosen using a performance based method].

In addition, Calvert and Banavar disclose that it would be advantageous use the relationship between performance and topology to make better core choices [Calvert -- Page 640, Section]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining a primary client using performance information and selecting a subset based upon performance information, as taught by Calvert into the invention of Banavar, in order to achieve a fast performing multicasting system which routes the packets of information to all nodes in a short amount of time.

3.3, paragraph 1] [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 61-62].

Regarding claim 7, Banavar teaches a method of multicasting information to a set of clients comprising:

determining a network location for each of the clients [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 66-67 - Col. 6 lines 1-3 - In order to group brokers into clusters by network location, it is required that the location be determined, i.e. pinging the clients];

Art Unit: 2143

selecting a subset of the clients to be primary clients based on the network location, the network location relating to a data topology [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 66-67 and Col. 6 lines 41-44 - Network location data, based upon the current configuration of the network, i.e. topology, is used to determine and furthermore to configure and group the brokers, i.e. primary clients, into clusters]; and

transmitting the information to the primary clients for retransmission to other clients in the set of clients [Banavar -- Figures 1 and 4A and Col. 3 lines 7-15 - Brokers, i.e. primary clients, receive information from central source, i.e. publishing broker (Col. 2 lines 54-55) and forward the information to their consumers, i.e. clients].

Banavar fails to explicitly teach determining a performance parameter for each of the clients and selecting a subset of the clients to be primary clients based on the performance parameter.

Calvert, however, teaches determining a performance parameter for each of the clients [Calvert - Page 640, Sec. 3.4, Paragraph 2 – In order to know the performance of nodes, the system must receive performance information, i.e. bandwidth and delay, from each of the nodes] and selecting a subset of the clients to be primary clients based on the performance parameter [Calvert -- Page 640, Sec. 3.5, Paragraph 2 – Core node, i.e. primary client, is chosen using a performance based method].

In addition, Calvert and Banavar disclose that it would be advantageous use the relationship between performance and topology to make better core choices [Calvert -- Page 640, Section 3.3, paragraph 1] [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 61-62].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining performance parameters for the clients and using

Art Unit: 2143

performance information in selecting a subset of clients to be primary clients, as taught by

Calvert into the invention of Banavar, in order to achieve a fast performing multicasting system

which routes the packets of information to all nodes in a short amount of time.

Regarding claim 10, Banavar teaches a method of forwarding information from a transmitting client to a receiving client in a multicast group comprising:

receiving an instruction from a multicast server to forward information to the receiving client [Banavar -- Col. 2 lines 54-57 - Multicast server, i.e. publishing broker, sends instruction, i.e. event, to subscriber broker to forward information on to subscribing clients] including a network location for the transmitting client and the receiving client, the network location relating to a data topology [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 66-67 - Col. 6 lines 1-3 and lines 41-44 - In order to group brokers into clusters by network location, it is required that the location be determined, i.e. pinging the clients. Network location data, based upon the current configuration of the network, i.e. topology, is used to configure and group the brokers, i.e. primary clients, into clusters];

receiving the information [Banavar -- Col. 2 line 56]; and

forwarding the information to the receiving client [Banavar -- Col. 2 lines 58-59].

Banavar fails to explicitly teach receiving performance information for determining a performance parameter.

Calvert, however, teaches receiving performance information for determining a performance parameter [Calvert -- Page 640, Sec. 3.4, Paragraph 2 – In order to know the performance of

Application/Control Number: 09/656,538 Page 10

Art Unit: 2143

nodes, the system must receive performance information, i.e. bandwidth and delay, from each of the nodes].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the receiving of performance information for determining performance parameters, as taught by Calvert into the invention of Banavar, in order to provide information to achieve a fast performing multicasting system which routes the packets of information to all nodes in a short amount of time.

Regarding claim 11, Banavar-Calvert teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 10 above, including displaying the information to a user [Banavar -- Col. 2 lines 58-59 – Clients subscribe to the information in order to watch/view the future information in which they have interest. Therefore, the reference implicitly teaches that the information is displayed to the client].

Regarding claim 12, Banavar-Calvert teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 10 above, including displaying the information to a user without positively indicating to the user that the information is being forwarded [Banavar -- Col. 3 lines 13-15 and Col. 6 lines 41-44 and 61-63 -- Because only brokers are needed for configuring, it is implicitly taught that the forwarding of events is transparent to the clients; therefore, they do not positively know what is going on in the background, i.e. forwarding of messages].

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 18, Banavar teaches a client interface configured to transmit the information to a primary client from the server and to instruct the primary client to forward the information to a secondary client [Banavar -- Col. 3 lines 16-27 - Publisher broker's interface, i.e. program, transmits information to subscriber brokers, i.e. primary clients, which forward information on to it's clients, i.e. secondary clients]; and logic for determining a primary client using network location of the client, the network location relating to a data topology [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 66-67 and Col. 6 lines 41-44 - Network location data, based upon the current configuration of the network, i.e. topology, is used to configure and group the brokers, i.e. primary clients, into clusters].

Banavar fails to explicitly teach determining a primary client using performance information. Calvert, however, teaches selecting a primary client, i.e. a broker, based upon performance criteria [Calvert -- Page 640, Section 3.5, paragraph 2 - Core node, i.e. primary client, is chosen using a performance based method].

In addition, Calvert and Banavar disclose that it would be advantageous use the relationship between performance and topology to make better core choices [Calvert -- Page 640, Section 3.3, paragraph 1] [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 61-62].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of performance information in determining a primary client, as taught by Calvert into the invention of Banavar, in order to achieve a fast performing multicasting system which routes the packets of information to all nodes in a short amount of time.

Regarding claim 19, Banavar teaches a client configured to forward multicast information to another client comprising:

a server interface configured to receive the information from the server [Banavar -- Col. 2 lines 54-56 - Subscribing broker receives message, i.e. event, from publishing broker, i.e. server] and to exchange with the server control and network location data relating to a data topology [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 66-67 and Col. 6 lines 41-44 - Network location data, based upon the current configuration of the network, i.e. topology, is used to configure and group the brokers, i.e. primary clients, into clusters. Control information directs the nodes to function as subscribers or brokers. Therefore, because this is used to configure system, information must be exchanged with publishing broker, i.e. server, to properly configure the system]; and

a client interface configured to forward the information to another client [Banavar -- Col. 2 lines 58-59].

Banavar fails to explicitly teach exchanging with the server, performance information.

Calvert, however, teaches sending performance information for determining performance parameters [Calvert -- Page 640, Sec. 3.4, Paragraph 2 – In order to know the performance of nodes, the system must receive performance information, i.e. bandwidth and delay, from each of the nodes].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate exchanging performance information with the server, as taught by Calvert into the invention of Banavar, in order to provide information to achieve a fast performing multicasting system which routes the packets of information to all nodes in a short amount of time.

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 20, this is a system claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim

1. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 20 is rejected based upon the same rationale.

Regarding claim 21, Banavar teaches a computer program product for multicasting information, the computer program product being embodied in a computer readable medium and comprising computer instructions [Banavar -- Col. 3 lines 16-21]. The remaining limitations of claim 21 are similar to the limitations set forth in the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale.

6. Claims 1-7, 10-12 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banavar et al. (U.S. 6,336,119) in view of Chen et al. (U.S. 5,831,975).

Regarding claim 1, Banavar teaches a method of multicasting information to a set of clients comprising:

transmitting the information to a primary client from a server [Banavar -- Figures 1 and 4A and Col. 3 lines 7-12 - Brokers, i.e. primary clients, receive information from central source, i.e. publishing broker (Col. 2 lines 54-55)]; and

instructing the primary client to forward the information to a secondary client [Banavar - Figures 1 and 4A and Col. 3 lines 13-15 – Brokers forward the information to their consumers].

Banavar fails to teach determining a primary client using performance information and a network location of the client.

Chen, however, teaches selecting a core node, i.e. primary client, based upon bandwidth, i.e. performance, information and network location or topology, i.e. border nodes [Chen -- Col. 8 lines 15-28].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of performance information and network location in determining a primary client, i.e. core node, as taught by Chen into the invention of Banavar, in order to achieve an efficient and fast multicast tree [Chen -- Col. 8 line 18] which can guarantee some quality-of-service (QoS) [Chen -- Col. 6 lines 47-49].

Regarding claim 2, Banavar-Chen teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including receiving performance information from the set of clients [Chen -- Col. 8 lines 23-25 - In order to choose a core node with sufficient bandwidth, i.e. performance information, the system must receive performance information from each of the nodes].

Regarding claim 3, Banavar-Chen teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including pinging clients to determine the network location of the clients [Chen -- Col. 8 lines 16-22 - In order to determine which nodes are border nodes, it is required for the server to ping the clients and use that address to determine the client's

location on the network, for example, to determine if a node is a border node. Therefore, this limitation is implicitly taught].

Page 15

Regarding claim 4, Banavar-Chen teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including wherein the information is streaming video [Chen -- Col. 3 lines 25-32 – Video conferencing applications require underlying system to support multicasting].

Regarding claim 5, Banavar teaches a method of multicasting information to a set of clients comprising:

transmitting the information to the primary clients for retransmission to other clients in the set of clients [Banavar -- Figures 1 and 4A and Col. 3 lines 7-15 – Brokers, i.e. primary clients, receive information from central source, i.e. publishing broker (Col. 2 lines 54-55) and forward the information to their consumers, i.e. clients].

Banavar fails to explicitly teach determining a performance parameter for each of the clients and selecting a subset of the clients to be primary clients based upon performance information and network location.

Chen, however, teaches determining a performance parameter for each of the clients [Chen -Col. 8 lines 23-25 – In order to choose a core node with sufficient bandwidth, i.e.

performance information, the system must receive performance information from each of
the nodes] and selecting a subset of the clients to be primary clients based upon the performance
information and network location [Chen -- Col. 8 lines 15-28 – Core node is selected by

Art Unit: 2143

choosing a node on the border, i.e. network location, and one which has sufficient bandwidth, i.e. performance information].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining performance parameters for the clients and using performance information to select a subset of nodes to be primary clients based upon performance information, as taught by Chen into the invention of Banavar, in order to achieve an efficient and fast multicast tree [Chen -- Col. 8 line 18] which can guarantee some quality-of-service (QoS) [Chen -- Col. 6 lines 47-49].

Regarding claim 6, Banavar teaches a method of multicasting information to a set of clients comprising:

transmitting the information to the primary clients for retransmission to other clients in the set of clients [Banavar -- Figures 1 and 4A and Col. 3 lines 7-15 - Brokers, i.e. primary clients, receive information from a central source, i.e. publishing broker (Col. 2 lines 54-55) and forward the information to their consumers, i.e. clients].

Banavar fails to explicitly teach determining a network location for each of the clients, determining a primary client using performance information and network location and selecting a subset of clients to be primary clients based on performance and network information.

Chen, however, teaches determining a network location for each of the clients [Chen -- Col. 8 lines 16-22 - In order to determine which nodes are border nodes, it is required for the server to determine the locations of each of the nodes], determining a primary client, i.e. core node, based upon performance criteria and network location [Chen -- Col. 8 lines 15-28] and

Art-Unit: 2143

selecting a subset of the clients to be primary clients based upon the performance and network location information [Chen -- Col. 8 lines 15-28 - Core node is selected by choosing a node on the border, i.e. network location, and one which has sufficient bandwidth, i.e. performance information].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining of network location for the clients, determining a primary client using performance and network information and selecting a subset of the clients to be primary clients, i.e. core nodes, based on network location and performance, as taught by Chen into the invention of Banavar, in order to achieve an efficient and fast multicast tree [Chen -- Col. 8 line 18] which can guarantee some quality-of-service (QoS) [Chen -- Col. 6 lines 47-49].

Regarding claim 7, this is a method claim similar to the method claimed in claims 5 and 6. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 7 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 10, Banavar teaches a method of forwarding information from a transmitting client to a receiving client in a multicast group comprising:

receiving an instruction from a multicast server to forward information to the receiving client [Banavar -- Col. 2 lines 54-57 - Multicast server, i.e. publishing broker, sends instruction, i.e. event, to subscriber broker to forward information on to subscribing clients];

receiving the information [Banavar -- Col. 2 line 56]; and forwarding the information to the receiving client [Banavar -- Col. 2 lines 58-59].

Banavar fails to explicitly teach receiving performance information for determining a performance parameter and network location information relating to the topology.

Chen, however, teaches receiving performance information for determining a performance parameter and network information relating to the topology of the network [Chen Col. 8 lines 15-28 – In order to ascertain the bandwidth to determine if sufficient capabilities exist and border node information, it is required that performance and network topology information be received which detail this information about the nodes].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the receiving of performance information for determining performance parameters and network information relating to the topology of the network, as taught by Chen into the invention of Banavar, in order to provide information to achieve an efficient and fast multicast tree [Chen -- Col. 8 line 18] which can guarantee some quality-of-service (QoS) [Chen -- Col. 6 lines 47-49].

Regarding claim 11, Banavar-Chen teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 10 above, including displaying the information to a user [Banavar -- Col. 2 lines 58-59 - Clients subscribe to the information in order to watch/view the future information in which they have interest. Therefore, the reference implicitly teaches that the information is displayed to the client].

Regarding claim 12, Banavar-Chen teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 10 above, including displaying the information to a user without

Art Unit: 2143

positively indicating to the user that the information is being forwarded [Banavar -- Col. 3 lines 13-15 and Col. 6 lines 41-44 and 61-63 – Because only brokers are needed for configuring, it is implicitly taught that the forwarding of events is transparent to the clients; therefore, they do not positively know what is going on in the background, i.e. forwarding of messages].

Regarding claim 18, Banavar teaches a client interface configured to transmit the information to a primary client from the server and to instruct the primary client to forward the information to a secondary client [Banavar -- Col. 3 lines 16-27 – Publisher broker's interface, i.e. program, transmits information to subscriber brokers, i.e. primary clients, which forward information on to it's clients, i.e. secondary clients].

Banavar fails to explicitly teach determining a primary client using performance information and a network location of the client relating to the topology.

Chen, however, teaches selecting a primary client, i.e. core node, based upon performance criteria and network location information [Chen -- Col. 8 lines 15-28 - Core node is selected by choosing a node on the border, i.e. network location, and one which has sufficient bandwidth, i.e. performance information].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining a primary client, i.e. core node, using performance and network location information, as taught by Calvert into the invention of Chen, in order to achieve an efficient and fast multicast tree [Chen -- Col. 8 line 18] which can guarantee some quality-of-service (QoS) [Chen -- Col. 6 lines 47-49].

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 19, Banavar teaches a client configured to forward multicast information to another client comprising:

a server interface configured to receive the information, i.e. control information, from the server [Banavar -- Col. 2 lines 54-56 - Subscribing broker receives message, i.e. event, from publishing broker, i.e. server. Control information directs the nodes to function as subscribers or brokers]; and

a client interface configured to forward the information to the client [Banavar -- Col. 2 lines 58-59].

Banavar fails to explicitly teach exchanging with the server, performance and network location information.

Chen, however, teaches sending performance information for determining performance parameters [Chen Col. 8 lines 15-28 – In order to know the performance and location of nodes, the system must receive performance information, i.e. bandwidth and network location information, i.e. topology for determining border nodes, from each of the nodes]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate exchanging of both performance information and network location information, as taught by Chen into the invention of Banavar, in order to provide information to achieve an efficient and fast multicast tree [Chen -- Col. 8 line 18] which can guarantee some quality-of-service (QoS) [Chen -- Col. 6 lines 47-49].

Art·Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 20, this is a system claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim

1. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 20 is rejected based upon the same rationale.

Regarding claim 21, Banavar teaches a computer program product for multicasting information, the computer program product being embodied in a computer readable medium and comprising computer instructions [Banavar -- Col. 3 lines 16-21]. The remaining limitations of claim 21 are similar to the limitations set forth in the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

- 7. Applicant's arguments filed March 9, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
 - (A) Applicant contends that Banavar does not disclose the use of network locations for determining a primary node, whereas claim 1 calls for this limitation.

In response to argument A, Examiner asserts that Banavar discloses using information relating to geographic location *or* network location data for grouping broker nodes into clusters, thereby choosing a primary client, i.e. broker, for each cluster [Banavar -- Col. 5 lines 66-67]. Therefore, Banavar, in fact, allows for two ways of choosing cluster assignment, either by geographic location or network location, as claim 1 recites. Furthermore Col. 6 lines 41-47

discloses configuring the system for the cluster group multicast (CGM) which takes into consideration any network changes, i.e. topology changes, for readjusting any of the clusters from the initial, i.e. static, configuration. In addition, see the rejection above for further explanation. Therefore, the Examiner accordingly demurs to this assertion because Banavar does in fact disclose using network location information for cluster assignment.

(B) Applicant contends that Calvert teaches away from the claimed invention and does not disclose or suggest using performance information and network location.

In response to argument B, Examiner asserts that Calvert does not teach away from the claimed and in addition does suggest using performance and network information for choice of core nodes. Calvert is concerned with determining the optimal core selection based upon various parameters and performance information of a network. See Page 638, Abstract and Section 1 Introduction. In addition, regardless of whether Calvert deals with group selection techniques or network techniques, he still is concerned with the network in selecting a core node. Furthermore, Calvert suggests using performance information and topology of the network. See Page 640, section 3.3 paragraph 1. He explicitly suggests that analyzing the performance information and topology of the network will allow for better core choices. Please see rejection above for further explanation. Therefore, the Examiner accordingly demurs to any assertion that Calvert teaches away from the invention or that he does not suggestion core selection based on performance and topology because Calvert does in fact disclose this information as shown above.

Art Unit: 2143

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mauro Jr. whose telephone number is 703-605-1234. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/656,538 Page 24

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

May 25, 2004

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100